

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and consideration of the following remarks.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0074672 (hereinafter Daniels). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Daniels was filed on December 11, 2002 as a *Continuation-in-part* application of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/886,695, filed on June 22, 2001, which is a *Continuation-in-part* application of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/787,683, filed on March 21, 2001 as national stage of international application No. PCT/US99/21900, filed on September 21, 1999.

Since Daniels was filed as a *Continuation-in-part* application, not all portions of the description of Daniels are entitled to an effective filing date earlier than December 11, 2002 or June 22, 2001. However, the present application was filed on February 2, 2000, which was earlier than the filing dates of Daniels and some of its parent applications. The *Continuation-in-part* applications involve newly added materials that were not supported by their parent applications. Thus, the description of Daniels relied upon by the Office Action may not have an effective filing date earlier than the filing date of the present application.

For example, page 8, paragraph 85 and page 9, paragraph 93 of Daniels was relied upon for the rejection of independent claims 1 and 2. However, these paragraphs appear to be absent from the parent application of Daniels that was filed earlier than the present application. The rejection of independent claims 1 and 2 were improperly based at least partially on these paragraphs. Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1. Thus, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for claims 1-5 is respectfully requested.

Further, the Office Action relied upon “page 6, paragraph 72, lines 17-21” of Daniels for the rejection of the independent claims 1-2. However, “page 6, paragraph 72” contains only one line of text, which reads

“[0072] FIG. 40 is an assembled view of a conductive coil;” (page 6, paragraph 72, Daniels)

This does not match the citation of “lines 17-21”; and the description of “page 6, paragraph 72” does not appear to be relevant to the corresponding claim limitations. There may have been a typographical error in the Office Action in citing a portion of Daniels. However, based on the description of the Office Action, Applicant could not locate a proper portion that may apply. Even if it were located in Daniels, it may not be entitled to an effective filing date earlier than the filing date of the present application.


Furthermore, Daniels describes an entirely different system. Daniels shows to provide video signals to the display devices, such as a composite video signal (see, e.g., page 8, paragraph 87, column 2, lines 31-38, Daniels). It is understood that video signals have a predetermined sizes. For example, NTSC TV standard has a predetermined size; HDTV has a predetermined size.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no prior art reference showing the evidence, motivation, and suggestion for scrolling video frames, such as TV video frames. Since the display devices of Daniels receive video signals tailored for the display devices, there would not be arrangement of scrolling “under exclusive control of” the display devices of Daniels.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Furthermore, if an extension is required, Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/20, 2005



Lenhua Wang
Reg. No. 48,023

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300